UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/564,237	01/10/2006	Martin J. Edward	GB03 0112 US1	6993	
24738 7590 09/28/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS PO BOX 3001			EXAMINER		
			SITTA, GRANT		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001		001	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2629		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/564,237	EDWARD, MARTIN J.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
GRANT D. SITTA	2629		

	GRANT D. SITTA	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDIT	ION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cl periods:	the same day as filing a Noti eplies: (1) an amendment, at al (with appeal fee) in compli	ce of Appeal. To avoid abar fidavit, or other evidence, w ance with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	Ivisory Action, or (2) the date se ter than SIX MONTHS from the b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHE	mailing date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding ar nortened statutory period for rep	nount of the fee. The appropria ly originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(	e)), to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (sec v); er form for appeal by materia	e NOTE below); ally reducing or simplifying the	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	See attached Notice of No.		PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		rate, timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		☑ will be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the a	ffidavit or other evidence is	necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under	appeal and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but</li> </ol>		•	
See Continuation Sheet.  12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (I			oc because.
13.  Other:			
/Sumati Lefkowitz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629	/Grant D Sitta/ Examiner, Art Unit	2629	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant remarks, Examiner agrees with Applicant in how the two video signals are written from the two data lines 1-na and 1-nb in the digital memory cell of Sato (Remarks, pg 9, 1st). But, Examiner is relying on data line 1-1 and the scan line 2-2 as an example of how a column conductors supplies each voltage to each matrix element, which is further discussed in col. 9, lines 27-67 (Final Office Action, page 3, 2nd). Examiner also agrees that Sato is relied upon to teach the structure but does not provide for supplying power supply voltages along the column conductors.

However, Aoki is being relied upon to teach applying a pre-charge signal and timing (fig. 5, col. 10, lines 6-45). Examiner is interpreting the pre-charging as the power supply voltage. Pre-charging is a common technique for applying a potential to data lines to bring the cells to a potential in preparation of a data signal. In light of MPEP 2111 wherein claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation, examiner is interpreting power supply voltage as pre-charging. Examiner notes in col. 2-3, lines 57-12 Aoki discusses how pre-charging voltages are supplied from a potential 4v and 8v. Examiner suggests distinguishing pre-charging form a power supply voltage.

Next, Applicant contends the prior art of reference fails to teach "a plurality of first and second column conductors, each arranged for inputting data signals to or outputting data signals." Because of the "or" operator as long as the prior art of record teaches performing one of the limitations the prior art reads on the current claim limitations. If Applicant intends the column conductors to input/output data signals to/from the matrix elements of a respective column, examiner suggests using "and".